STATE OF CALIFORNIA - HEALTH AND WELFARE AGENCY Edmund G. Brown Jr., Governor

DEPARTMENT OF BENEFIT PAYMENTS
744 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

January 10, 1975

ALL-COUNTY LETTER NO. 75-13

TO: **ALL COUNTY WELFARE DIRECTORS**

SUBJECT: **EW TURNOVER STUDY**

REFERENCE:

The attached report provides findings of a recent study of the relationship between eligibility worker turnover and errors made in the determination of eligibility and the calculation of aid grants. The study was undertaken as a Department of Benefit Payments Corrective Action project.

Several counties have expressed an interest in seeing the results of this study. In sharing it with you, we would like to acknowledge that the findings are tentative in nature. Although the figures indicate that there is no direct correlation between county error rates and eligibility worker turnover rates, more refined studies might indicate different trends.

The Department is pursuing a variety of error analysis and corrective action projects, the results of which may be of interest to county welfare administration. Findings from such projects will be shared with counties on an ongoing basis.

Sincerely,

DENNIS O. FLATT
Deputy Director

Attachments

cc: CWDA

OBSOLETE

Superseded by ACL #77-15

Issued 3-17-77

GEN 654 (2/74)

Error Rates vs. Turnover Rates

Bob Magnani
Information Development Bureau
Program Support Branch
Department of Benefit Payments

November 8, 1974

Finding

The statistics for the January 1974 to June 1974 Quality Control period for selected counties indicate that there is no significant correlation between their QC error rates and their EW (eligibility worker) turnover rates.

Method

This report presents the results of a statistical analysis undertaken to determine the correlation, if any, between error rates and EW turnover rates for 14 counties.

Error rates were computed from data supplied by the Quality Control Bureau for the six-month period January - June 1974 according to the formula:

$$\text{Error Rate} = \frac{\text{Number of cases with errors during 1/74 - 6/74}}{\text{Number of cases reviewed during 1/74 - 6/74}} \times 100\%$$

The term "error" as used here includes both agency and recipient errors and is the sum of overpayments, underpayments and ineligibles found in the cases reviewed.

Turnover rates were computed from the formula:

$$\text{Turnover Rate} = \frac{\text{Number of accessions (new EWs) 1/74 - 6/74}}{\text{Number of EWs employed on 6/30/74}} \times 100\%^{a/}$$

The data used in this formula were obtained by the Program Information Bureau October 11, 1974, from the Annual Report of Public Welfare Employees (Form WP 19.5) and the Public Welfare Employees Accessions and Separations Report (Form WP 20.59).

---

a/ In the usual formula for calculating gross turnover rate, one divides by the average number of EWs employed during the study period. However, the figures used here should be good estimates of these averages and thus their effect on the final results are negligible.

Three statistical measures of correlation were used:

Pearson's product - moment correlation coefficient r_p, Spearman's coefficient of rank correlation r_s, and Kendall's coefficient of rank correlation r_k. These values were computed to be $r_p = -0.038$, $r_s = -0.209$, and $r_k = -0.122$. After testing at both the 1% and 5% levels of significance the above correlations were found to be insignificant. Put another way, these results do not allow us to reject the hypothesis that there is no correlation between error rates and EW turnover rates.

Table 1 below gives error and turnover rates for the 14 selected counties. The counties are ranked in descending order according to their turnover rates.

Table 1

Turnover Rates and Error Rates for
14 Selected Counties

January 1974 to June 1974

County	Turnover rate (%)	Error rate (%)*
A	23.9	24.5
B	23.2	22.5
C	18.3	24.6
D	17.5	27.5
E	16.7	24
F	16.0	17.7
G	15.7	40.5
H	14.1	30
I	12.7	14.8
J	12.3	24.8
K	12.1	29.2
L	10.2	17.8
M	8.0	29.5
N	5.0	25.8

* Based on error data available at the time of the study; may differ slightly from final published error rates for the period.

It might be noted that a similar report published in March 1974 by the Research Support Bureau also found no significant correlation between error rates and turnover rates. The report examined these rates for calendar year 1972 in 10 counties and determined a correlation of $r = 0.098$, which again lends almost no support to the hypothesis that error rates are correlated to turnover rates.